

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 050

UD 032 294

AUTHOR Witt, Peter A.
TITLE Evaluation of the Totally Cool, Totally Art Program, Austin Parks and Recreation Department.
SPONS AGENCY Texas Univ., Austin. Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.; National Recreation and Park Association, Arlington, VA.
PUB DATE 1997-06-00
NOTE 36p.; Funding also provided by the Austin Parks and Recreation Department.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *After School Programs; Art Activities; *Art Education; Black Students; High School Students; High Schools; Hispanic Americans; *Recreational Activities; Tutorial Programs; Urban Schools; *Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS *Texas (Austin)

ABSTRACT

The "Totally Cool, Totally Art Program" (TCTA) was initiated by the Austin (Texas) Parks and Recreation Department in the fall of 1996. Through the TCTA program, visual arts classes were offered to teens twice a week at each of nine recreation centers. At eight of the nine sites, six separate 4-week sessions were held, with three sessions at the last site. At each site, the program began at approximately 4:30 pm with a 1-hour tutoring program or other activity organized by the teen leader from the host center. A class in a particular art medium was then offered by a practicing artist from 5:30 to 7:30. Target group size was planned for 8 to 20 participants at each site. The overall program was coordinated by staff from the Dougherty Arts Center. Approximately 55% of participants were African American, and about 3% were Hispanic American. A total of 292 teens signed up for at least 1 of the 6 sessions, and the total participant hours were over 10,000. When teens who participated were asked what they might be doing if they were not participating in the program, they indicated that they might be sitting at home, watching television, or doing homework. The program was seen by organizers as a way to avoid teens' being bored and a way to provide an incentive to do well in school so that they could participate. Program satisfaction data and comments from participants and their parents indicate that there will be many repeat signups in the future. At the end of two of the sessions, the program sponsored an Open House and art display, and a newsletter was distributed at each session. (Contains 10 tables.) (SLD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

**Evaluation of the
Totally Cool, Totally Art Program
Austin Parks and Recreation Department**

Compiled by

Peter A. Witt, Head
Department of Recreation,
Park and Tourism Sciences
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-2261
Phone: (409) 845-7324
FAX: (409) 845-0446

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
TRANSMIT THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter Witt

June, 1997

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

This project would not have been possible without the involvement of many different people. Appreciation is expressed to members of the staff of the Dougherty Arts Center (Maria Ciccirelli and Carlos Pineda), the program specialists for the Totally Cool, Totally Art Program (Jan Leuschke and Jerome Schoolar), and the artists and teen leaders who staffed the program. The involvement of Robert Armistead, Mini Freeman, and Janet Martin of the Austin Parks and Recreation Department is also appreciated. Special thanks is also extended to Tiffany Cabin and Irene Gonzales who conducted the teen and parent interviews, and to Texas A&M undergraduate and graduate students who helped transcribe the interview tapes (Jennifer Flusche, Jason Bocarro, David Bundrick, and Donnie Norred) and Vivian Gonzales who helped with many aspects of managing the data and preparing the final report. In addition to funding from the Austin Parks and Recreation Department, partial funding also was supplied through the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health and the National Recreation Foundation/National Recreation and Park Association.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary

Totally Cool, Totally Art Program Evaluation

"Someone told me about it, and I went and stayed up there for a while and I tried to figure out what it was and they were doing some fun stuff so I thought it would be good to come to class every day and do something instead of stay at home all the time and sit around and stuff like that."

The Totally Cool, Totally Art program (TCTA) was initiated by the Austin Park and Recreation Department (APARD) in the fall of 1996. Through the TCTA program visual arts classes were offered to teens twice a week (Monday/Wednesday or Tuesday/Thursday) at each of nine recreation centers operated by the APARD. At eight of the nine sites, six separate four week sessions were offered. At the ninth site, only three sessions (D - F) were offered.

The overall program was coordinated by staff from the Dougherty Arts Center as part of the Social Fabric Initiative which had been funded for the 1996-97 year in an effort to deal with teen issues in the city of Austin. When teens who participated in the TCTA program were asked what they might be doing if they were not participating in the program, they indicated they might just be sitting at home, watching television, or doing homework. For other teens the program provided a more structured alternative to just hanging out on the street or doing an unstructured activity. The program was also seen as a way for teens to avoid being bored and provided an incentive to do well in school so they could participate in the program.

At each site the TCTA program began at approximately 4:30 p.m. with a one hour tutoring program or other activity organized by the teen leader from the host center. From 5:30-7:30 p.m. a class in a particular art medium was offered by a practicing artist with the assistance of the teen leader from the local center. Participants could sign up for as many sessions as they wished. Target group size at each site was 8 to 20 participants. For some of the sessions (claymation and computer animation) where specialized equipment or facilities were required, teens were transported to the Dougherty Arts Center for the art portion of the program. Table One provides an overview of the art activities that were provided at each site during each of the six program sessions.

As part of the program, organizers developed a newsletter that was printed and distributed each session. At the end of sessions C and F, the program sponsored an Open House at Givens Recreation Center. At each Open House, the art works of teens enrolled in the program were displayed.

Program Attendance: Workload

The following represents information about the program participants:

- * Approximately 50% of the program participants were male and 50% were female, with program participants ranging in age from 9 to 16 years of age (70% of the participants between 12 and 16). Approximately 55% of the program participants were African-American, 33% Hispanic, with the rest Caucasian or from other backgrounds.
- * Approximately 50% of the teens had previously participated in other programs at APARD recreation centers, while for the other half, the TCTA program represented their first program enrollment at a recreation center.

The following statements provide an overview of overall program attendance.

- * 292 teens signed up for at least one of the six sessions (A-F). 43.5% of the teens only signed up only for one of the sessions, with another 22.9% signing up for two of the sessions. The rest of the teens signed up for three or more sessions. In general, the number of sessions attended showed a similar pattern at each of the centers.
- * Average attendance was 11.0 participant days, with the number of participant days that teens attended across all sessions ranging from 1 to 55. 48.3% of the teens attended between 1 and 6 days, with 26.7% attending between 7 and 16 days; 15.8% between 17 and 26 days; and the remaining 9.2% attending from 27-55 days.
- * Combined, there were 3205 participant days of total attendance during sessions A through F of the program. At 3 hours per day, this yields 9615 participant hours. In addition, there were another 300 participant hours involved with each of the two Open Houses, or a total of 600 hours. Thus, the total program involved a total of 10,215 participant hours.
- * The total number of attendance days ranged from 278 at South Austin to 574 at Montopolis for those centers that offered six sessions. Dove Springs had 202 total attendance days. The average number of days that teens attended at each center ranged from 7.5 at Parque Zaragoza to 14.6 at Hancock. (Table Five)
- * Average enrollment for each session ranged from 9.3 for Metals to 17.0 for Drawing and Painting.

For a first year program, the program appeared to attract a lot of interest. However, the total volume of attendance was only about 45% of the capacity of the program. Thus, the program has considerable opportunity to grow in succeeding years. The program satisfaction data and comments from the teens and their parents indicate that there will be considerable repeat sign-ups in future years. In addition, positive word-of-mouth advertising of the program (teen to teen, and teen leader to teen), plus additional efforts to provide information about the program through the local schools should considerably boost attendance in future years.

Program Efficiency: Cost per Participant Hour

The total cost for the program was \$90,115. Given that there were 10,215 participant hours, this makes the cost per participant hour approximately \$9.20 per hour. In assessing program costs, it is important to remember that two adults (teen leader and artist) were providing leadership during each hour of program service. This arrangement was critical to creating ongoing mentoring for the teens through the teen leaders and quality art instruction through the artists. It also ensured a 1 to 10 teen ratio even when a given session was running at the targeted program capacity of 20 teens per site per day.

It should also be noted that this was a new program, with attendance only running at 45% of capacity (20 teen per day per site capacity vs. 9.0 actual teens per day per site). Based on the high level of satisfaction reported for the program by both teens and parents, and the general level of enthusiasm for the program shown by recreation center personnel, attendance should increase in the future. Additional teens can be easily accommodated with little increase in overall program costs. Thus, assuming that the program reaches 85% of capacity, this would bring the per participant hour cost down to \$4.67. This latter figure is in line with per participant hour costs reported by Dougherty Arts Center personnel for fee based classes that are conducted at the center.

Program Quality

Using APARD's standard program quality evaluation card, teens were surveyed at the end of sessions C and F, to determine their ratings of various components of the program such as the facilities, registration process, timeliness of beginning the program, staff competence, and quality of interactions with staff. Ratings were made on a scale from 1=Very Poor to 10=Very Good. All of the ratings were toward the high end of the scale with means in excess of 8 on the 10 point scale, with several over 9.0.

The high ratings of staff quality are particularly significant given the goals of the program organizers. They designed the program so that besides teaching art, opportunities for mentoring could be provided. This process was facilitated by involving as program leaders both the teen leaders from the recreation centers and artists who were sensitized to deal with issues beyond art that might arise through interactions with the participants. Beyond the data, interview comments received from participants, their parents and the artists help illustrate the types of relationships that were established and the importance of these relationships to all of the parties involved with the program.

In addition, the teens were also asked to rate their overall enjoyment of the program, their overall experience in the program, and how well the program and staff compared to programs at other sites. All ratings were again high, with all items scored between 8.63 and 8.89. These ratings provide clear indications of the participant satisfaction with these aspects of the program. These ratings were supported by some of the comments made about the program by both the

participants and their parents.

Program Effectiveness

A questionnaire was developed to help determine the impact of the program on the participants. The initial portion of the survey asked the teens to provide information about their gender, race, age, grade, and whether or not they had previously attended Park and Recreation Department programs. In addition, questions related to four separate scales were included as follows:

- * *Protective Factors Scale* (Witt, Baker, & Scott, 1996), nine subscales, four items per subscale, scored from -3 = Decreased a Great Deal to +5 = Increased a Great Deal. Descriptions of the nine-subscale are listed in Table Nine. Teens were asked to respond to items that were listed in following format: "As a result of my participation in the Totally Cool, Totally Art Program, I have increased/decreased my..." (Table Ten).
- * *Affinity for Art*, four items were included measuring ability to finish art projects that are started, use one's imagination, and do art, along with how much one likes art. The items were presented and scored in a manner similar to the *Protective Factors Scale*.
- * *Perceived Life Chances* (Jessor, Donovan, & Costa, 1989), ten items, scored from 1 = Very Low to 5 = Very High.
- * *Self-Esteem* (Jessor, Donovan, & Costa, 1989), measuring teens' beliefs about their abilities and attributes in various domains including social skills, academic competence, and personal attractiveness. Six items, scored from 1 = Not Well at All to 4 = Very Well.

Questionnaires were administered at the end of session C (January 27-30, 1997) and at the end of session F (April 28 - May 1, 1997). Ideally the questionnaires would have been administered before the beginning of session A (first session) and then again at the end of session F (last session). Ninety-six (96) teens filled out questionnaires. Forty (40) filled them out after session C, 32 only after session F, while 24 filled out questionnaires after both sessions C and F. For the *Protective Factors Scale*, two separate analyses were undertaken. Scores for individuals completing the surveys on both occasions were compared. In addition, because of the wording of the questions ("As a result of my participation in the Totally Cool, Totally Art Program, I increased/decreased my..."), it was possible to directly interpret responses for teens filling out the questionnaires on only one occasion to see if they felt that they had benefitted from their participation in the program.

Even when teens filled out the questionnaires on only one of the two occasions, responses in general indicated that teens perceived substantial benefits from participating in the program. Means were all on the plus (+) side, and in general fell between +2 and the high +3s, (i.e., "increased some" to "increased a lot"). For the 24 teens who filled out the survey after session C and again after session F, there were statistically significant increases between the two time periods in four of the protective factor areas: knowledge of and interest in utilizing *neighborhood resources*; understanding that there are *interested and caring adults* who are willing to take the

time to work with teens; understanding the importance of *being able to work with others*, including having the ability to get along with other teens, be cooperative, and be a good member of a team or group; and the ability to *work out conflicts* by dealing in a positive manner with problems that arise with other teens.

Participants who filled out the surveys on both occasions indicated a greater *Affinity for Art* (mean after session C = 3.33; mean after session F = 3.48; $p \leq .05$). For the *Perceived Life Chances* and *Self-Esteem* changes between sessions C and sessions F for the 24 participants who filled out questionnaires on both occasions were not statistically significant.

Given the problems in obtaining pre- and post-measures for a large sample of teens, and problems associated with not collecting the pre-measure data at the true beginning of the program, rather than at the end of session C, results from the questionnaire data provide some positive indications of program impact. In general teens consistently reported positive changes in areas that have been associated in other studies with enabling teens to avoid problem behavior areas such as juvenile delinquency, dropping out of school, or becoming involved with drugs. In addition, the program did seem to increase the affinity that teens had for art, thus expanding the range of potential activity involvements that can be pursued during available free time.

In general, the program did an admirable job of meeting the goals as stated by the program organizers. As a first year program, the program has tremendous potential for growth and should show even greater positive impacts in future years.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Table of Contents	vi
Description of the Program	1
Program Evaluation	7
Workload	7
Program Efficiency: Cost Per Participant Hour	14
Program Quality	15
Program Effectiveness	18
Timing of Questionnaire Administration	19
Questionnaire Administration Procedures	21
Questionnaire Results	21
Conclusions Based on the Questionnaire Data	25
The Bottom Line...Did the Program Do What It Set Out to Do?	26

Totally Cool, Totally Art Program Evaluation Report¹

Description of the Program

The Totally Cool, Totally Art program (TCTA) was initiated by the Austin Park and Recreation Department (APARD) in the fall of 1996. Through the TCTA program, visual arts classes were offered to teens twice a week (Monday/Wednesday or Tuesday/Thursday) at each of nine recreation centers operated by the APARD. At eight of the nine sites, six separate four week sessions were offered. At the ninth site, only three sessions (D - F) were offered.²

The overall program was coordinated by staff from the Dougherty Arts Center as part of the Social Fabric Initiative which had been funded for the 1996-97 year in an effort to deal with teen issues in the City of Austin. When teens who participated in the TCTA program were asked what they might be doing if they were not participating in the program, they indicated they might just be sitting at home, watching television, or doing homework. For other teens the program provided a more structured alternative to just hanging out on the street or doing an unstructured activity.

"...bad things probably. Be out in the streets, like gang banging, like I used to do and stuff. But, it just got to me and I just got here and it just got me away from that and it was more funner than being out there." (Program participant)

"Well if I wasn't in the program I would be here at the center mostly...Sometimes I play basketball, sometimes I just hang out over there." (Program participant)

The program was also seen as a way for teens to avoid being bored and provided an incentive to do well in school so they could attend the program.

[If I wasn't in the program, I would probably be bored.] "I probably would not be doing as well on my school work because if I don't do my work, I can't come here." (Program participant)

¹As part of the overall program evaluation strategy, interviews were undertaken with some of the teens participating in the program, parents of some of the teens, recreation center teen leaders, and artists who provided the program instruction. Quotes from these interviews are included (in quotation marks) throughout the report to help support and amplify some of the data that is presented.

²Due to the interest of the participants at one of the sites for one session, the session extended several weeks beyond the originally planned four weeks.

The goals for the program, as stated by the program organizers were to:

- * To expand recreation center activities and increase access to quality arts education programs during non-school hours for urban children living in resource-poor environments and economically depressed neighborhoods.
 - * To recruit youth ages 12-16 with an interest in arts education who may currently not participate in other recreation center program.
 - * To implement developmentally appropriate, community-based programs for children ages 12-16 that fill the gap of activities offered at recreation centers and provide recognition and appreciation of a culturally diverse heritage.
 - * To collaborate and network with recreation teen leaders providing alliances to identify and assess needs of under-served children. The cultural arts - recreation center partnerships should result in reducing at-risk behavior while youth benefit from lifelong arts education skills.
 - * To provide a complete program of mentoring, academic tutoring and arts education.
 - * To provide a celebration of accomplishment and sharing of neighborhood pride through open house ceremonies.
 - * To increase the opportunity for children working with professional artists to develop self-expression and creative potential through cultural and artistic diversity, while nurturing self-esteem and inspiring academic and career experience.
 - * To create a climate in which the artist's contribution to society is valued and supported.
- (TCTA Fact Sheet, August 20, 1996)

During the follow-up interviews, the teens expressed several goals that they had when signing up for the program. These included having something to do and avoiding boredom. In addition, they hoped to learn new skills like how to draw or use computers to create art; learn how to be a better artist; expand their imagination and creativity; and improve communication skills and learn how to get along better with other teens.

[I hoped to learn] "more about art because I wasn't really good at drawing so I wasn't a very good artist." (Program participant)

"I liked to learn how to draw and stuff. I didn't know how to draw or anything or do anything or how to do a picture of yourself. I've never painted you know done a drawing of myself. And they taught you how to do it right and you are proud of yourself for doing that." (Program participant)

Parents of the teens also expressed certain goals that they hoped the program would accomplish. These included learning responsibility and team work; improving social skills; gaining confidence and a better sense of self; and gaining an appreciation for art and/or having an impact on future career choices.

"I hoped they would learn a little responsibility, you know, being responsible. I think they could learn team work, getting along with other kids and stuff, things like that."
(Parent)

"Well, he is very shy and he doesn't have very many friends. He has a few. But one thing I was hoping is that he would get some help with his social skills; being in a group, participating in group projects." (Parent)

"I was hoping he would get an appreciation for art...that he would learn. That he would find it interesting and be able to say 'Oh, I want to do it.' And I love the variety. I think the pace is excellent because they are still young and if you give them less than that then they get bored. So the pace is kind of intensive and they move on to something else. So they get a pretty good variety." (Parent)

"I guess growth, interaction with other kids and learn some things about art. It's just not pencil and paper. You know, it is other things." (Parent)

"Just a sense of himself. You know, and having an opportunity to express himself."
(Parent)

In addition, the artists who were employed to teach art to the teens noted that they had certain expectations for the program. They indicated that they wanted to share their love for art with the teens and improve the teens' ability to undertake art projects; they were also aware that the program provided a setting that gave teens an alternative to being on the streets and provided an opportunity for teens to work through a number of issues in their lives. Several artists also noted that the program provided them with an opportunity to give something back to the community and perhaps provide teens with an opportunity that they themselves might not have had when they were growing up.

"A lot of the teens are looking for something good to do. They don't want to be in trouble; they really don't. I had put myself in their position and thought 'well what would I want and what did I want as a teenage developing young woman' from this program."
(Art teacher)

"I liked the outreach concept of it. It is part of the city which is neglected often. As for me, it was more opportunity to give something back; taking the skills that I have as a painter and sharing those with people. When I was a teenager, I did not have the opportunity to have people to come to my school and give me instruction. I look back and I put myself in a position and hope that I can give them what I was not given when I was their age." (Art teacher)

At each site the TCTA program began at approximately 4:30 p.m. with a one hour tutoring program or other activity organized by the teen leader from the host center. From 5:30-7:30 p.m. a class in a particular art medium was offered by a practicing artist with the assistance

of the teen leader from the local center. Participants could sign up for as many sessions as they wished. Target group size at each site was 8 to 20 participants. For some of the sessions (claymation and computer animation) where specialized equipment or facilities were required, teens were transported to the Dougherty Arts Center for the art portion of the program. Table One provides an overview of the art activities that were provided at each site during each of the six program sessions.

As part of the program, organizers developed a newsletter that was printed and distributed each session. The newsletter helped provide continuity for the overall program by including information about program staff, dates for future sessions, and tidbits about program happenings at a particular site.

"...we obviously took this program into facilities that weren't currently identified with the arts. They are known more for sports. Even though the sites have throughout the years maybe had some arts and crafts programming, a lot of kids just didn't really pay attention to it. And now TCTA Cool came out; they are so high profile with their posters and getting the word out that it drew in these kids and opened their eyes to what is there now. Next time there is an arts class, I think these kids will be excited and take a second look to see what it is all about instead of 'let's go play basketball.' I think they are going to look at those flyers a little longer and take advantage of it." (TCTA Program Specialist)

Table 1: Type of Class Offered at Each Center for Each Session

	Session A 10/28-11/21	Session B 11/25-12/19	Session C 1/6-1/30	Session D 2/3-2/27	Session E 3/3-4/3	Session F 4/7-5/1
Alamo M/W	Metals	Computer Animation	Drawing/ Painting	Multi- Media	Weaving	Claymation
Hancock T/TH	Metals	Computer Animation	Drawing/ Painting	Weaving	Claymation	Community Mural
Dove Springs T/TH	---	---	----	Multi- Media	Metals	Claymation
Dottie Jordan M/W	Computer Animation	Drawing/ Painting	Weaving	Metals	3-D Sculpture	Multi- Media
Montopolis T/TH	Computer Animation	Drawing/ Painting	Weaving	Metals	3-D Sculpture	Multi- Media
Zaragoza M/W	Weaving	3-D Sculpture	Metals	Claymation	Multi-Media	Drawing/ Painting
Givens T/TH	Weaving	3-D Sculpture	Metals	Claymation	Multi-Media	Drawing/ Painting
Pan Am M/W	Multi- Media	Metals	Computer Animation	Drawing/ Painting	Weaving	3-D Sculpture
South Austin T/TH	Multi- Media	Metals	Computer Animation	Drawing/ Painting	Weaving	3-D Sculpture

At the end of sessions C and F, the program sponsored an Open House at Givens Recreation Center (January 31, 1997 and May 2, 1997; 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.). At each Open House, the art works of teens enrolled in the program were displayed. The exhibitions provided an opportunity of program participants, members of their families, artists, program coordinators, site and program managers, and community officials such as the Park and Recreation Department Director and members of the Austin City Council to come together to view and celebrate the accomplishments of the program participants. Between 300 and 350 people attended each Open House. The teens, parents, and program leaders were very positive about the Open Houses, noting their pride in seeing the work that had been produced during the program displayed. Seeing the work displayed of teens from other centers displayed was also of interest. Teens noted that they were inspired by the exhibit to work harder to improve their own abilities.

"It kinda made me feel kinda weird because, that's mine. You know? Yeah, everybody did a really good job on everything. I think it was pretty cool." (Program participant)

"I know the pride...I could just feel it in the air. The pride of the kids in the work they had done and it was very professionally displayed and everyone was going 'ewww!', ahhhh!', and even if they were standing near their art where other people were looking at it, like my kids had a couple of the funky sculptures, they would kind of stand about ten feet away and watch people and see how they would react to [the art] and they would come to me and say 'wow, listen to what she said.' And it was just that whole thing of getting someone who is not a parent, who is not a teacher, who is not being paid to tell them that their work is good to tell them their work is good." (Teen leader)

"The thing that I saw, especially with the young artists exhibition, was the excitement it created. Becoming aware that they would be recognized...that they were all by themselves, especially at an age where the recognition is very important. But there were other teens just like them who were also being recognized and they had a lot in common even though they might have been from different parts of the city." (Dougherty Art Center, Art School Manager)

Program Evaluation

Discussion between TCTA program organizers led to decisions to undertake program evaluation in four areas. Within limitations of expense and information accessibility, an evaluation strategy was designed to obtain and analyze relevant data in each of the following areas.

- * Workload: Number of participants served.
- * Efficiency: Cost of serving each participant.
- * Program Quality: Participant ratings of the quality of selected site and leader characteristics, along with ratings of the overall value of the program.
- * Program Effectiveness: Impact of program.

Results of the data collection and analysis process are presented in the following sections.

Workload

At each of the nine centers where the program operated, sign-up and attendance data were kept for each of the program sessions. The data consisted of the name of each program attendee and indications of whether he/she attended the program on a given night. In general, fairly complete and accurate data appeared to be kept by each center. The importance of having good attendance data was stressed to each teen program leader by APARD supervisory staff at the beginning of the program. From this data, calculations were made concerning the total number of teens served by the program, the total number of sessions that each teen participated in over the life of the program (one to six) year, particular artistic mediums that drew the most participants, and other usage statistics.

Less complete data were available regarding certain background characteristics of the participants. However, some questions regarding gender, age, race, and whether participants had previously attended programs at APARD recreation centers were included on questionnaires that were administered. If these data are representative, then the following descriptions of program participants apply.

- * Approximately 50% of the program participants were male and 50% were female.
- * Program participants ranged in age from 9 to 16 years of age, with 70% of the participants between 12 and 16.
- * Approximately 55% of the program participants were African-American, 33% Hispanic, with the remainder (12%) Caucasian or from other backgrounds.
- * Approximately 50% of the teens had previously participated in other programs at APARD recreation centers, while for the other half, the TCTA program represented their first program enrollment at a recreation center.

"...before this program, I didn't know much about the [recreation center] and because of this program, she [daughter] also comes to [the recreation center] on other days when there is no art program. I think they should tell more kids about it. I think they should hire these kids to go out there and tell more kids about it. And that they really should keep this program going. It is really good for the kids. It keeps them off of the streets. It teaches them to work with one another and it just opens up a whole new world for them." (Parent)

"...the good part about the program [was that] it brought these other kids in that wanted to do the programs and since then now they have become rec. kids. They know that there are other things to do...some of those parents a lot of times they think of recreation centers negatively...that it is just bad people who go and hang out there and bad things happen. Now I have three families that have enrolled their kids in other programs at our rec. center...they learned about our center through Totally Cool, Totally Art. They brought their kids because they really wanted their kids to do that program and since then they have enrolled in other programs." (Teen leader)

When asked why they enrolled in the TCTA program, teens responded with statements like:

"Someone told me about it, and I went and stayed up there for a while and I tried to figure out what it was and they were doing some fun stuff so I thought it would be good to come to class everyday and do something instead of stay at home all the time and sit around and stuff like that."

"I like to do the computers and they said we would be doing 3-D animation and stuff like that, like cartoons and stuff; So I liked doing that...two friends of mine were in there too, so that's kind of one of the reasons that I still would of done it."

"Well, I thought it would be something for me to do instead of being out here on the streets and everything. So, I thought it would be educational and I would get to do different things and meet different people and make friends and stuff."

The following summary statements and tables (two through six) provide an overview of overall program attendance.

- * 292 teens signed up for at least one of the six sessions (A-F). 43.5% of the teens signed up for only one of the sessions, with another 22.9% signing up for two of the sessions. The rest of the teens signed up for three or more sessions. (Table Two)
- * In general, the number of sessions attended showed a similar pattern at each of the centers. (Table Three)
- * The number of teens signed up for each of the sessions ranged from 95 for session C to 136 for session D, which represented between 32.5% and 46.6% of the total teens who signed up (N=292) for at least one of the sessions. (Table Four)
- * Average attendance was 11.0 participant days, with the number of participant days that teens attended across all sessions ranging from 1 to 55. 48.3% of the teens attended between 1 and 6 days, with 26.7% attending between 7 and 16 days; 15.8% between 17 and 26 days; and the remaining 9.2% attending from 27-55 days.
- * Combined, there were 3205 participant days of total attendance during sessions A through F of the program. At 3 hours per day, this yields 9615 participant hours. In addition, there were another 300 participant hours involved with each of the two Open Houses, or a total of 600 hours. Thus, the total program involved a total of 10,215 participant hours.
- * Centers involved differing numbers of teens at some time in the program, ranging from 21 at South Austin to 52 at Pan Am, for those centers that offered the program over all six sessions. Dove Springs, which only offered the program over the last three sessions, involved 18 different teens in the program. (Table Five)
- * The total number of attendance days ranged from 278 at South Austin to 574 at Montopolis for those centers that offered six sessions. Dove Springs had 202 total attendance days. (Table Five)
- * The average number of days that teens attended at each center ranged from 7.5 at Parque Zaragoza to 14.6 at Hancock. (Table Five)
- * The number of teens registered for each medium ranged from 90 for 3-D Sculpture and 93 for Metals to 117 for Weaving, 119 for Drawing and Painting, and 121 for Multi-Media. Average enrollment for each session ranged from 9.3 for Metals to 17.0 for Drawing and Painting. (Table Six)

Table Two: Number of Sessions Attended

Number of Sessions Attended	Number of Teens Participating at this Level	Percent of Total Participation (N=287)
One Session	127	43.5
Two Sessions	67	22.9
Three Sessions	32	11.0
Four Sessions	27	9.2
Five Sessions	21	7.2
Six Sessions	18	6.2

Table Three: Session Attendance by Center

Center	Total Number of Different Teens Participating	Number of Sessions Attended and Percent of Total Teens Attending Program					
		One Session	Two Sessions	Three Sessions	Four Sessions	Five Sessions	Six Sessions
Alamo	29	14 48.3	7 24.1	1 3.4	1 3.4	3 10.3	3 10.3
Hancock	24	12 50.0	2 8.3	3 12.5	1 4.2	2 8.3	4 16.7
Dove Springs*	18	9 50.0	4 22.2	5 27.8	-	-	-
Dottie Jordan	31	12 38.7	8 25.8	4 12.9	2 6.5	2 6.5	3 9.7
Montopolis	50	19 38.0	12 24.0	8 16.0	6 12.0	4 8.0	1 2.0
Parque Zaragoza	38	17 44.7	12 31.6	1 2.6	3 7.9	4 10.5	1 2.6
Givens	29	10 34.5	6 20.7	1 3.4	6 20.7	3 10.3	3 10.3
Pan Am	52	28 53.8	10 19.2	6 11.5	6 11.5	1 1.9	1 1.9
South Austin	21	6 28.6	6 28.6	3 14.3	2 9.5	2 9.5	2 9.5
Total	292 100.0	127 43.5	67 22.9	32 11.0	27 9.2	21 7.2	17 5.8

*Dove Springs only operated for the last three sessions of the program.

Table Four: Number of Teens Attending by Session

Session Number	Number of Teens Who Participated in this Session	Percent of Total Teens Participating in the Program (N=292)
Session A	97	33.2
Session B	125	42.8
Session C	95	32.5
Session D	136	46.6
Session E	119	40.8
Session F	106	36.3

Table Five: Total and Average Attendance Days by Center

Center	Number of Different Teens Involved in At Least One Session	Total Number of Days of Attendance	Average Days of Attendance per Teen
Alamo	29	355	12.2
Hancock	24	350	14.6
Dove Springs*	18	202	11.2
Dottie Jordan	31	298	9.6
Montopolis	50	574	11.5
Parque Zaragoza	38	284	7.5
Givens	29	402	13.9
Pan Am	52	462	8.9
South Austin	21	278	13.2
Total	292	3205	11.0

*Dove Springs only operated for the last three sessions of the program.

Table Six: Number of Participants by Medium

Medium	Number of Times Program Offered (N=51)	Number of Teens Enrolled Across All Sessions (N= 292 Total)	Average Enrollment per Session
Metals	9	93	9.3
Computer Animation	6	67	11.2
Drawing and Painting	8	119	17.0
Multi-Media	8	121	15.1
Weaving	8	117	14.6
3-D Sculpture	6	90	15.0
Claymation	5	61	12.2
Community Mural	1	10	10.0

For a first year program, the program appeared to attract a lot of interest. However, the total volume of attendance was only about 45% of the capacity of the program. Thus, the program has considerable opportunity to grow in succeeding years.³ The program satisfaction data and comments from the teens and their parents indicate that there will be considerable repeat sign-ups in future years. In addition, positive word-of-mouth advertising of the program (teen to teen, and teen leader to teen), plus additional efforts to provide information about the program through the local schools should considerably boost attendance in future years.

"I think we had a very successful program. I don't think major overhauls need to occur. I would like to see enrollment higher; I think we were very successful with our numbers but maybe after the first Open House, after half of the program, that we could have made another effort to recruit new kids into the program. This creates the snowball effect. You put that one kid through that door and he gets his friends, and he gets his friends; that type of thing. Everybody made a hard push in the beginning and then we got so busy and so focused on the program and what was taking place we really didn't think about going back out there with a clean slate to draw in new kids. I think if we made that effort half way through, we could maybe double our numbers next year." (TCTA Program Specialist)

³Between the various centers, 51 total sessions were offered, with a total of 3205 participant days of involvement across all sessions. Thus, each session averaged 62.8 days of participant involvement. With sessions running an average of 7.0 days (eight days less days when sessions were not held due to holidays), an average of 9.0 teens attended a given session each day (62.8 attendance days per session / 7.0 days per session). Program organizers originally set program capacity at 20 students per day. Thus, the program was operating at 45% of capacity (9.0 actual teens per session / 20 teen capacity per session).

Program Efficiency: Cost Per Participant Hour

Calculations of cost per participant hour were undertaken utilizing attendance and program cost data as supplied by APARD staff. The total cost for the program was \$90,115 (Table Seven). Given that there were 10,215 participant hours, this makes the cost per participant hour approximately \$9.20 per hour.

In assessing program costs, it is important to remember that two adults (teen leader and artist) were providing leadership during each hour of program service. This arrangement was critical to creating ongoing mentoring for teens through the teen leaders and quality art instruction through the artists. It also ensured a 1 to 10 teen ratio even when a given session was running at the targeted program capacity of 20 teens per site per day.

It should also be noted that this was a new program, with attendance only running at 45% of capacity (20 teen per day per site capacity vs. 9.0 actual teens per day per site). Based on the high level of satisfaction reported for the program by both teens and parents, and the general level of enthusiasm for the program shown by recreation center personnel, attendance should increase in the future. Additional teens can be easily accommodated with little increase in overall program costs. Thus, assuming that the program reaches 85% of capacity, it would generate 19,295 participant days, which would bring the per participant hour cost down to \$4.67. This latter figure is in line with per participant hour costs reported by Dougherty Arts Center personnel for fee-based classes that are conducted at the center.

Table Seven: Program Cost Figures

Cost Category	Expense	Totals
Personnel		
a) Program Specialists	20,687	
b) Artists	16,790	
c) Other Services	1,512	
d) Teen Leaders	13,566	
Benefits (a,b,d)	3,905	56,460.00
Postage	16	
Printing/Photocopy	686	
Art Supplies	16,817	
Office Supplies	1,086	
Food/Snacks	7,208	
Van Rental	3,850	
Mileage	87	33,655.00
Total		90,115.00

Program Quality

APARD has an ongoing system for determining levels of satisfaction among program participants. For the TCTA program, a green two-sided card was filled out by program participants at the end of each of the six program sessions. For this study, only data collected at the end of sessions C and F were analyzed. Each program participant was asked to fill out a general survey about the program, especially created for this study, at the end of each of these two sessions. The green program quality evaluation card used by APARD was attached to the survey.

One group of questions asked the teens to rate various components of programs such as the facilities, registration process, timeliness of beginning the program, staff competence, and quality of interactions with staff. Ratings were made on a scale from 1=Very Poor to 10=Very Good (Table Eight). All of these ratings were toward the high end of the scale with means in excess of 8 on the 10 point scale, with several over 9.0.

"In the computer one, the guy was real nice and knew what he was doing." (Program participant)

"...the instructors knew what they were talking about and the equipment worked." (Program participant)

"They supplied a lot of stuff that we could use and they had more stuff than I expected they'd have and they just had lots of painting; they had everything." (Program participant)

"One thing that I would leave the same is the funding. It was wonderful to have the money to go out and get these very crucial art supplies. You don't want to just throw out a bunch of egg cartons and water colors and say 'make a rocketship out of this.' You want to be able to show them the technical aspect of art just as well from blacksmithing to paint brushes to bulky paper, and different paints from acrylic to water colors too. They got a broad base of experience and technique due to the funding and we were able to pick up some great supplies for this program, which is kind of weakness for a lot of the programs." (TCTA Program Specialist)

The high ratings of staff quality are particularly significant given the goals of the program organizers. They designed the program so that besides teaching art, opportunities for mentoring could be provided. This process was facilitated by involving as program leaders both the teen leaders from the recreation centers and artists who were sensitized to deal with issues beyond art that might arise through interactions with the participants. Beyond the data, interview comments received from participants, their parents and the artists help illustrate the types of relationships that were established and the importance of these relationships to all of the parties involved with the program.

"I would definitely tell other parents about this program and in fact I have. Some of them have signed up. I don't know what the other programs are like. To me the critical reason that I like it is that I was really thinking of the staff. It is the first program that I have been in that is targeted for preteens. She is just incredible with understanding that age group." (Parent)

"I had a few instances where personal conflicts, family conflicts, problems with drugs in the past [came up] and you just get to a point where trust is established and they will open up to you and talk about their situations...So I try to instruct them in art and give them an outlet to their turmoil; but that was not something directed to the class as a whole...I would sit with the kid individually in an afternoon to see about their circumstances and talk to them." (Art Teacher)

"Once a level of trust is established then some of those personal problems at home start to fill out. I wanted to get across a few things that art is product, that is the mission here. I really wanted to get that across because a lot of kids want to have it and go and you can not do it. Another goal was...the channeling of emotions in their work. I am big on giving. If it is instructions or something that they are given; doing things fairly for other people. In another group, the message was anger. Because the pieces they were doing dealt with violence." (Art Teacher)

"I guess it would be kind of stupid for me to say that you could separate the art from these other issues, because it is about personal expression and those kinds of things. Of course you have to be sensitive enough to know what it is that you are dealing with." (Art Teacher)

[Speaking of the Open House]: "The ones that you've touched base with, they all came up and they all wanted to introduce me to either a friend or a family member that they brought." (Art Teacher)

Table Eight: Teen Ratings of Selected Program Attributes

	End of Session 3 (N=63)		End of Session 6 (N=53)	
Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
I feel the: cleanliness of this facility is...	8.14	2.66	8.85	1.79
safety of this facility is...	8.49	1.96	8.60	2.05
registration process is...	8.66	1.88	8.88	1.82
activities began on time...	8.41	2.06	8.77	1.92
individual attention I receive from staff is...	8.54	2.28	8.62	1.91
staff treat me with respect...	8.84	1.79	8.94	1.83
staff are able to answer my questions...	8.95	1.86	8.83	1.70
instructor was knowledgeable about the subject...	8.87	1.61	8.98	1.41
instructor's teaching skills are...	9.10	1.52	8.86	1.73
instructor was well prepared for this program...	9.03	1.57	9.04	1.59
I feel the program was worth my time and money...	8.67	2.01	8.98	1.66
I feel the enjoyment of this program was...	8.63	2.02	9.00	1.69
Overall, my experience of the program was...	8.89	1.57	8.85	1.82
Compared to other sites, how would you rate the quality of the program provided at this site?	8.79	1.71	8.90	1.85
Compared to other sites, how would you rate the quality of staff service at this site?	8.85	1.85	9.06	1.83

In addition, the teens were also asked to rate their overall enjoyment of the program, their overall experience in the program, and how well the program and staff compared to programs at other sites. Ratings were again made on a 10 point scale from Very Poor to Very Good. All ratings were again high, with all items scored between 8.63 and 8.89. These ratings provide clear indications of the participant satisfaction with these aspects of the program. These ratings were supported by some of the comments made about the program by both the participants and their parents.

"This one is probably the best [programs] I've been to." (Program participant)

"Yes. I didn't like to draw or anything, you know and when I got here it was all like boring. But then it just started getting really fun the moment they started bringing all kind of paints and stuff. I was like this is so cool and stuff, let me try it or something. And I just started liking it. When I get bored or something I draw stuff, and try to do everything I've learned." (Program participant)

"This is the first time I tried this much art. I think you can paint and express your feelings on a piece of paper with paint...you don't have to 'give out' to get at people, you can just paint them down." (Program participant)

"I like it more. Because like when we go to...art classes at school, I know how to draw better. The teacher gives us something to draw up on the board and I know how to do that much better than I did before." (Program participant)

Program participants were asked how they had heard about the program. At the end of session C, 75% indicated that they heard about the program from a friend, with 8.3% indicating that a flyer/brochure was the source of their information, and 14.6% indicating that they had heard through other means (e.g., from a center staff member or from their parents). At the end of session F, 53.8% indicated that they heard about the program through a friend, and 7.7% indicated that they had heard about the program through a flyer/brochure. The number indicating another source such as someone at the center or a parent rose to 34.6%. It is a good sign that word-of-mouth appears to be the strongest way to get information about the program to prospective participants. Other teens who like the program, parents who hear about the program and feel that it has something to offer their children, and center personnel who use their contacts to spread the word about the program are all signs that there is strong support for the program from a variety of stakeholder groups.

Program Effectiveness

A questionnaire was developed to help determine the impact of the program on the participants. The initial portion of the survey asked the teens to provide information about their gender, race, age, grade, and whether or not they had previously attended Park and Recreation Department programs. In addition, questions related to four separate scales were included as follows:

- * *Protective Factors Scale* (Witt, Baker, & Scott, 1996), nine subscales, four items per subscale, scored from -3 = Decreased a Great Deal to +5 = Increased a Great Deal. Descriptions of the nine-subscales are listed in Table Nine. Teens were asked to respond to items that were listed in following format: "As a result of my participation in the Totally Cool, Totally Art Program, I have increased/decreased my..." (Table Ten)⁴.
- * *Affinity for Art*, four items were included measuring ability to finish art projects that are started, use one's imagination and do art, along with how much one likes art. The items were presented and scored in a manner similar to the *Protective Factors Scale*.
- * *Perceived Life Chances* (Jessor, Donovan, & Costa, 1989), ten items, scored from 1 = Very Low to 5 = Very High.
- * *Self-Esteem* (Jessor, Donovan, & Costa, 1989), measuring teens' beliefs about their abilities and attributes in various domains including social skills, academic competence, and personal attractiveness. Six items, scored from 1 = Not Well at All to 4 = Very Well.

Timing of Questionnaire Administration. Questionnaires were administered at the end of session C (January 27-30, 1997) and at the end of session F (April 28 - May 1, 1997). Ideally the questionnaires would have been administered before the beginning of session A (first session) and then again at the end of session F (last session). This approach would have permitted comparison of questionnaire data collected at the end of the program to baseline data collected at the beginning. Several factors mitigated against using this approach. Funding for the Social Fabric Initiative Programs was approved on short notice and initial administrative energy needed to be devoted to hiring artists, advertising the program, ordering supplies, and other details of getting the program in place at each of the recreation center sites. Contact with the evaluation team at Texas A&M was made in early November. After

⁴There has been a recent move to identify factors that can "modify, ameliorate, or alter a person's response to some environmental hazard that predisposes them [teens] to a maladaptive outcome" (Rutter, 1985, p. 600). It is hoped that increasing protective factors will help youth develop "resilience," i.e., the "capacity for successful adaptation, positive functioning, or competence," even though they may live in high-risk environments or be experiencing chronic stress (Egeland, et al., 1993, p. 517). This approach shifts attention from the risks to which youth are exposed to the protective mechanisms and the processes of negotiating risk situations (Rutter, 1990).

Table Nine: Description of Protective Factor Subscales

<u>Neighborhood Resources</u> : Knowledge of and interest in utilizing neighborhood recreation opportunities, including organized and informal programs and opportunities.
<u>Interested and Caring Adults</u> : The perception that there are adults who care about and are interested in teens, and who are available to help teens when they have problems.
<u>Sense of Acceptance and Belonging</u> : The perception of being liked and accepted by other teens and/or family members.
<u>High Controls Against Deviant Behavior</u> : The understanding that it is important and necessary to stay out of trouble and obey the rules.
<u>Models for Conventional Behavior</u> : Respect for and appreciation of teens, adults, and institutions who model or reinforce appropriate behavior.
<u>Positive Attitude Toward the Future/Future Expectations</u> : Perception of oneself as having a positive future including the willingness to set and work to achieve goals, the willingness to be spontaneous and creative, and the understanding that one has some control over the outcome of daily events.
<u>Value on Achievement</u> : Interest in and understanding of the importance of doing well in school. Also includes the general idea of being successful and trying to do one's best in any area of involvement.
<u>Ability to Work with Others</u> : Understanding the importance of and having the ability to get along with other teens, be cooperative, and be a good member of a team or group.
<u>Ability to Workout Conflicts</u> : The ability to deal in a positive manner with problems that arise with other teens.

discussion with the APARD staff, it appeared that the first time it was feasible to collect survey data was at the end of session C (end of January).

Given the timing, adaptations of a true pre-post program design were undertaken. Thus, teens were surveyed at the end of session C (pre- or beginning point data) and at the end of session F (post- or ending point data). Changes in scores over that period of time (approximately three months) could be attributed in part to participation by the teens in the TCTA program.

Unfortunately, attendance data from the first several program sessions already indicated that teens participating in one session might not continue to the following session. Thus, it was predicted that a less than desirable percentage of teens participating in session C would also participate in session F. This would have made the number of surveys available for comparison purposes below a desirable level. With this concern in mind, the *Protective Factors Scale*, in particular, was modified to permit its use to gather data at a single point in time (i.e., from teens

who were participating in session C or session F, but not both) and also from teens who participated in both session C and session F.

Questionnaire Administration Procedures. Texas A&M University personnel met with APARD staff, and in particular the Teen Leaders from each of the recreation centers, to discuss procedures for administering the questionnaires. Detailed written instructions were provided. It was suggested that all questionnaire items be read to teens to avoid any problems with reading ability. Completed surveys were sent to Texas A&M for coding and computer analysis.

Questionnaire Results. Ninety-six (96) teens filled out questionnaires. Forty (40) filled them out after session C, 32 only after session F, while 24 filled out questionnaires after both sessions C and F. For the *Protective Factors Scale*, two separate analyses were undertaken. Scores for individuals completing the surveys on both occasions were compared. In addition, because of the wording of the questions ("As a result of my participation in the Totally Cool, Totally Art Program, I increased/decreased my..."), it was possible to directly interpret responses for teens filling out the questionnaires on only one occasion to see if they felt that they had benefitted from their participation in the program.

Even when teens filled out the questionnaires on only one of the two occasions, responses in general indicated that teens perceived substantial benefits from participating in the program. Means were all on the plus (+) side, and in general fell between +2 and the high +3s, (i.e., "increased some" to "increased a lot"). (First four columns of Table Ten).

There is no particular explanation why the teens who filled out the questionnaire only at the end of session C had higher scores than teens who only filled out the questionnaires at the end of session F. Since these were two different groups of teens, it is difficult to identify the reasons for the differences. The analysis of teens who filled out the questionnaires at the end of session C and at the end of session F provides a better answer to the question of whether changes in scores over time can be attributed to the impact of the program.

For the 24 teens who filled out the survey after session C and again after session F, there were statistically significant increases between the two time periods in four of the protective factor areas (see the comparison of data in the last four columns of Table Ten).

- * Knowledge of and interest in utilizing *neighborhood resources*.

"If had known it was fun, I would have signed up before. I missed sessions because I didn't know about the program." (Program participant)

"I would probably be getting in trouble and everything...Because my mom, she works late and I would just be sitting there being bored and I had been wanting to do something..." (Program participant)

Table Ten: Protective Factor Scale Results

Protective Factor Dimension	Teens Completing Survey after Session C Only		Teens Completing Survey after Session F Only		Teens Completing Surveys after Both Sessions			
	Mean (N=39)	Standard Deviation	Mean (N=31)	Standard Deviation	After Session C Mean (N=24) Standard Deviation	After Session F Mean (N=24) Standard Deviation	After Session C Mean (N=24) Standard Deviation	After Session F Mean (N=24) Standard Deviation
Neighborhood Resources	2.67	1.81	2.02	2.88	3.11	1.59	*3.28	2.02
Interested and Caring Adults	3.30	1.56	2.18	2.90	3.02	1.75	*3.42	2.13
Sense of Acceptance and Belonging	3.16	1.60	1.80	2.76	3.00	1.69	3.16	2.17
High Controls Against Deviant Behavior	3.17	1.61	2.05	2.92	3.39	1.78	3.29	2.15
Models for Conventional Behavior	3.20	1.77	2.00	2.86	3.57	1.72	3.33	2.16
Positive Attitude Toward the Future/Future Expectations	3.19	1.46	2.01	2.81	3.39	1.57	3.48	2.14
Value on Achievement	3.31	1.47	2.14	2.92	3.29	1.52	3.42	2.13
Ability to Work with Others	3.22	1.66	2.08	2.75	3.16	1.64	*3.35	2.13
Ability to Workout Conflicts	2.92	1.51	1.61	2.76	2.66	1.72	*3.51	1.98

Scoring was undertaken on a scale from -3 = "Decreased a lot" to +5 = "Increased a lot," with the following intermediate points on the plus side of the scale: 1 = "Increased a little," 2 = "Increased some," 3 = "Increased a lot," 4 = "Increased quite a bit," and 5 = "Increased a great deal."

* Indicates that mean for session F was significantly different than mean for session C.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[Joining the program] "...was really quite by accident. We came here to pick up my other son who is in the basketball program and we ran into a group outside doing some metal stuff and we thought it was really neat. It helped him that there was a friend in the program from his school and he recognized which made it easier for him to say, 'Hey, I am going to do this; this is cool.'" (Parent)

"...what it is doing for them, again I can't stress enough it is giving them an alternative. It is opening up their mind to new things whereas they would be close minded because they haven't been exposed to it that much. Instead of just passing over the opening of their minds to the metalsmithing, the clay works, the everything, weaving, everything that is keeping their minds open and they're finding out that they enjoy it because they are trying it, whereas if they just saw it say on public access TV they would just change the channel and they would not be interested in it if they came across it here at the art center. But, because they are not necessarily forced into it because they see some of their friends doing it and they like it and they are seeing it one on one they are getting something out of it that way. That is what I believe they are getting out of it. An alternative." (Teen leader)

- * Understanding that there are interested and caring adults who are willing to take the time to work with teens.

"I like the one now. He makes me feel comfortable when I am drawing and stuff and he can understand what I am saying. Well, like how I feel when I draw." (Program participant)

"He came in knowing how to draw excellently; he enjoyed all the projects. But after a few classes and getting to know him, talking with him, his situation was difficult, where he was coming from his family. I got him to start thinking about it in terms of what comes out on the paper. Channel that....he had a lot of anger that was in jeopardy of becoming displaced towards other people perhaps but I said 'part of that is not going to work.' He was already an excellent artist, but he was trying to deal with these conflicts that he had at home when he would come to my class. And I have seen him several times after that class which is nice. He came in here one day to visit and painted for an hour and a half. I gave him a canvas that I had. During that time it was nice because we could talk as friends. I could say, 'how was the situation at home?' He asked me how my work was going. I don't feel like that I am the authority figure...He was always focused despite the chaos going on around him a lot of the times. For me, the success was in seeing how he really started looking at himself more. I wanted to put that mirror in front of him. That was my objective as a teacher. 'Look at yourself, now create' and I think I got through to him and hopefully that mirror will stay there now and we will be able to talk more in the future. To talk about painting and about what he is going to do with his art...because he knows he's got talent.

Hopefully we can get him somewhere." (Art teacher)

- * Understanding the importance of *being able to work with others*, including having the ability to get along with other teens, be cooperative, and be a good member of a team or group.

"The kids, the interaction, there is communication and stuff. The art teachers come with a really good attitude, an attitude of drawing and stuff...you can play but play in an art way, you know what I mean." (Program participant)

"I liked him being in the program. It has been very helpful for him to be in a program where he can improve his social relations, and two he likes art and it is something he is good at. And so it is something he can excel at." (Parent)

- * The ability to *work out conflicts* by dealing in a positive manner with problems that arise with other teens.

"It's helped me like get along with people better and like it's helped me respect my elders more. And it's helped me to expand my imagination." (Program participant)

In most of the other protective factor areas, scores moved in the positive direction between sessions C and F, but differences did not achieve statistical significance (in part due to the small number of respondents).

"They learn how to get along with each other, to work together as a team; they learn something new, how to stick with something such as this, break it down and just do it or whatever because I made my kids continue whether they liked it or not. You know you start something you need to know how to finish it and give it a chance to really learn how to like it. If you still don't like it then I won't make you do it, but if you don't give it a chance you will never know. So a lot of my kids discovered that they had hidden talents, we have great kids. They probably would have never known they could draw or build something if they hadn't gotten into the program and given it a chance." (Teen leader)

Participants who filled out the surveys on both occasions indicated a greater Affinity for Art (mean after session C = 3.33; mean after session F = 3.48; $p \leq .05$).

"Oh, yeah...like I'm doing really good at art in school and everything cause of the program...because it's helped me to like learn stuff about art...it helped me learn to like, I don't know, it just helped me a bunch. It helped me to like, I mean like how to paint better." (Program participant)

[Before the program] "I didn't like to draw or anything, you know and when I got here it was all like boring. But then it just started getting really fun the moment they started

bringing all kind of paints and stuff. I was like this is so cool and stuff, let me try it or something. And I just started liking it. When I get bored or something I draw stuff, and try to do everything I've learned." (Program participant)

"...there were a few kids that just one day they clicked and they made a....hook, quicker than anything. And I showed my portfolio of whatever works I had for customers and my card; they were like 'can you really make a living doing that?' There is one that all the kids are like 'Oh man, lets look at the cartoon' people throwing each others heads. They want to pick it up but they can't pick it up. They got into it...you all of a sudden see this light go on in their head and they are into it. And it is true; they don't see anything else; they don't hear anything else, and at the end of the day they are so proud of the things that they made; they want to take it home." (Art teacher)

"I think I have seven of [teens] that are talking like they want to go to art school; it's like given them some kind of hope. A lot of my kids, they just sit in the side and drew, but they didn't know all this stuff inside them. Once someone started showing them what this is how you do this line or this is how you paint this or this is how you lick that. These kids just like blossomed and I got kids drawing cartoon characters, drawing paintings of me and stuff. I mean it's ridiculous...its given them a hope that they never had before. I have had art contests and all kinds of stuff to keep them going so that little hope won't fade or whatever. They have gotten really good at it and they want it again. 'Are we going to have it during the summer?' 'Are we going to have it next year?'" (Teen leader)

For the *Perceived Life Chances* and *Self-Esteem* scales, changes between sessions C and sessions F for the 24 participants who filled out questionnaires on both occasions were not statistically significant.

"G--- she has always been a little bit involved in the athletics but, she is more on the quiet side; even though she does get involved in things and, you know, in teen group and stuff like that she is with other people, but kinda always lets them talk and just doesn't say a lot. I remember that they came [back from Dougherty Arts Center], it was toward the end of computer animation, and when they all came back they had their faces painted and they were all kind of dressed funny and stuff. Some of the kids were kind of teasing her and saying 'well ya'll look goofy...' She turned around and she looked at them she said, 'This was part of the Totally Cool, Totally Art Program and we had a lot of fun...I was with my friends.' It was just really good to see her just come out and stand up for herself and I think she had grown a lot as a person with her involvement with this program. So, that was really neat to see." (Teen leader)

Conclusions Based on the Questionnaire Data. Given the problems in obtaining pre- and post-measures for a large sample of teens, and problems associated with not collecting the pre-measure data at the true beginning of the program, rather than at the end of session C, results from the questionnaire data provide some positive indications of program impact. In general teens consistently reported positive changes in areas that have been associated in other studies with enabling teens to avoid problem behavior areas such as juvenile delinquency, dropping out

of school, or becoming involved with drugs. In addition, the program did seem to increase the affinity that teens had for art, thus expanding the range of potential activity involvements that can be pursued during available free time.

The Bottom Line...Did the Program Do What It Set Out to Do?

Reviewing the objectives stated by the staff who initially planned the TCTA program, it is clear that most of the objectives of the program were met. Since this was a start-up program effort, that in many cases represented the first undertaking of this kind at the various recreation centers, the program could certainly be judged a success. A review of the degree to which the program met each of its major objectives is included below.

- * To expand recreation center activities and increase access to quality arts education programs during non-school hours for urban children living in resource-poor environments and economically depressed neighborhoods.

The program provided an opportunity for 292 teens from resource-poor environments and economically depressed neighborhoods to become involved in a program that offered high quality art instruction. In a number of cases, the program provided a meaningful alternative to being involved in unacceptable activities, or just 'hanging out' or being bored. In other cases, the program expanded the range of legitimate programmatic involvements beyond sports.

- * To recruit youth ages 12-16 with an interest in arts education who may currently not participate in other recreation center program.

A substantial number of the Program participants had not participated in recreation center programs previously due to either lack of knowledge of recreation center program offerings or lack of interest in current programs. The TCTA program provided a vehicle for involving teens in a program that was perhaps more suited to some of their interests.

- * To implement developmentally appropriate, community-based programs for children ages 12-16 that fill the gap of activities offered at recreation centers and provide recognition and appreciation of a culturally diverse heritage.
- * To collaborate and network with recreation teen leaders providing alliances to identify and assess needs of under-served children. The cultural arts - recreation center partnerships should result in reducing at-risk behavior while youth benefit from lifelong arts education skills.

Using an "art school" approach, organized visual art curricula were presented. A combination of teen leaders and artists provided the leadership for the program. The two Open Houses provided opportunities for teens to gain recognition for their work. It was clear from the reaction of program participants, parents and program leaders that the teens benefitted greatly from their involvement in the

program and that the teens increased their appreciation for and skills in the visual arts. The program also inspired some of the teen leaders to hire some of the program artists to continue art programs at their centers during the summer. Thus the TCTA program has helped expand the repertoire of services and activities available for teens.

- * To provide a complete program of mentoring, academic tutoring and arts education.

The TCTA program did a good job of combining mentoring, academic tutoring and arts education into a single program. Teen leaders and artists were viewed as caring, involved adults who interacted well with the program participants. The program did seem to encourage completion of homework, provide an opportunity for tutoring, and provide first-rate visual arts instruction.

- * To provide a celebration of accomplishment and sharing of neighborhood pride through Open House ceremonies.

The two Open Houses were highly successful events that created a sense of community among the program participants across the various program sites, along with the various program leaders and artists. Parents, friends and community leaders who attended the Open Houses had a chance to view the "outcomes" of the various classes that were offered and celebrate the accomplishments of the participating teens.

- * To increase the opportunity for children working with professional artists to develop self-expression and creative potential through cultural and artistic diversity, while nurturing self-esteem and inspiring academic and career experience.

There was evidence that the program impacted the participants' interest in and ability to undertake art. While the evaluation design did not permit a thorough investigation of increases in self-esteem, there was evidence that selected "protective factors" increased (i.e., knowledge of and interest in utilizing neighborhood resources; understanding that there are interested and caring adults who are willing to take the time to work with teens; understanding the important of being able to work with others; and the ability to work out conflicts).

- * To create a climate in which the artist's contribution to society is valued and supported.

The contribution of the artists' to the program and to the lives of the program participants was clearly valued by both the teens and the teen leaders at the centers. In a number of instances, artists have now been hired, at the initiative of the recreation centers, to continue offering high quality visual art programs at the centers.